

Application Number	Date of Appln	Committee Date	Ward
104094/FO/2013/S2	4 <sup>th</sup> Nov 2013	13 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2014	Woodhouse Park

<b>Proposal</b>	Construction of the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road, incorporating within the City of Manchester one new road junction; one new rail bridge crossing; one balancing pond for drainage purposes; a pedestrian and cycle route and associated landscaping, lighting, engineering and infrastructure works
<b>Location</b>	Land to the south of Ringway Road; the east & west of Styal Road and west of the Styal Railway Line, Manchester
<b>Applicant</b>	Stockport MBC, Cheshire East Council , & Manchester City Council, C/o Agent
<b>Agent</b>	Mr Sam Rosillo, URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited, Bridgewater House, 58 - 60 Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 6LT

### **Introduction**

This application was presented to the Wythenshawe Area Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2014 for information purposes as the proposal is of more than local significance. The views of the Wythenshawe Area Committee were sought and they have recommended that the application be approved.

Planning permission is sought to construct a new dual carriageway from the A6 near to Hazel Grove (south east Stockport) to Manchester Airport and the link road to the M56. Designated as the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road (A6MARR), the application spans three Local Authority boundaries, namely the City Council, Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) and Cheshire East Council (CEC), and as such, detailed planning applications have been submitted to the three Local Authority's for determination of the element which falls within their respective boundaries.

This report will cover in detail the proposed scheme which falls within Manchester, however, it is considered important that all committee members are informed of the whole proposed scheme and relevant facts pertaining to it. Each local planning authority is responsible for the recommendation and determination of the scheme within their jurisdiction.

The applications submitted to the City Council, SMBC and CEC seek consent for the construction of a relief road orientated east - west between the A6 near Hazel Grove via the existing A555 to Manchester Airport. The proposed relief road comprises two new sections of dual carriageway, the first section is approximately 5.1km in length, starting from a new realigned section of the A6 at Hazel Grove(Stockport) extending west to the existing A555 at Woodford Road, Bramhall. The second section is approximately 3.2km in length and is an extension to the existing A555 which currently terminates at Wilmslow Road. The route continues in a westerly direction crossing Styal Road and heads towards Manchester Airport along the line of Ringway Road West.

Each of the proposed carriageways would measure 7.3m wide. The east and west bound traffic would be separated by a hard standing central reservation measuring between 1.8m and 3.9m across with a concrete central barrier. The Scheme speed limit is proposed mainly to be 50mph, however in Manchester, between Styal Road and the tie in to Ringway Road West, the central reservation is proposed to be kerbed and vary in width between 3.0m and 5.4m. At this point it is not proposed to have a central barrier due to the proposed speed restriction in this location being 40mph.

Between the A6 and Styal Road there is proposed to be a soft verge on either side of the carriageway with a shared-use cycleway and footway to the north of the relief road, separated from the carriageway by a soft verge. Between Styal Road and the tie in to Ringway Road, the shared cycleway and footway would be adjacent to the highway.

Whilst there have been no previous planning applications for the A6MARR, the general route of the proposed relief road is well established and has been defined and safeguarded for road construction purposes since the 1930's.

In 2001 the South East Manchester Multi-Modal Study (SEMMMS) was published which identified the problems with the transport system in the area and made recommendations for improvements. Amongst a package of investment in the public transport network, the study proposed that the local authorities develop roads of an appropriate scale designed to provide relief to the problems in the study area communities, but not to provide a new strategic route of regional and potentially national significance.

The content and objectives of SEMMMS were endorsed across the North West at all political levels. The A6MARR was seen as a major part in delivering the recommendations of SEMMMS with the scheme being prioritised by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and Transport for Greater Manchester.

In its Autumn Statement (2011) and National Infrastructure Plan (2011), Central Government presented its vision for the UK transport system, and later identified the A6MARR as one of 70+ major infrastructure projects aimed at addressing congestion and improving performance on the highway network.

### **Detailed Description of the Proposals**

The proposal starts in Stockport to the east of Hazel Grove with a traffic signalled T-Junction located on a realigned section of the A6. From this junction the relief road moves west and passes under the existing A6 (Buxton Road) which is taken over the main alignment on a new bridge for the use of buses, cycles and pedestrians. The route continues under the Hazel Grove to Buxton railway line and continues west passing properties on Old Mill Lane to the north.

It is proposed that a Bridleway quality bridge would be provided to divert the Public Right of Way (PRoW) and farm vehicles across the relief road near Old Mill Lane. The proposal continues west passing between Norbury Brook and to the rear of

residential properties on Darley Road and Ashbourne Road. At Macclesfield Road an at-grade signalised cross roads arrangement is proposed allowing all traffic movements with facilities for cyclists and pedestrians.

From the A523 Macclesfield Road the route continues west and runs to the north of Norbury Brook and associated woods and south of the residential streets of Sheldon Road and Longnor Road. The scheme then crosses authority boundaries into Cheshire East where the scheme crosses Norbury Brook via a bridge at Mill Hill Hollow. A bridleway quality bridge is proposed to divert the PRoW and farm vehicle access across the scheme at Hill Green. The route then passes in cutting under Woodford Road, which is proposed to be raised in the vicinity of the relief road, crossing back into Stockport where the road is proposed to climb on embankment over the West Coast Main Line.

A new at-grade signalised roundabout junction would provide access to the Bramhall Oil Storage Depot and a new link providing access to Chester Road is proposed. The junction is proposed to incorporate Pegasus facilities for equestrians, pedestrians and cyclists.

At the A5102 Woodford Road the existing roundabout joining with the A555 is proposed to be replaced by a new grade separated junction with the main route passing through cutting under Woodford Road. The junction configuration is proposed to be signalised to incorporate crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.

A shared cycleway and footway is proposed to be constructed adjacent to the existing A555, for its entire length, within Stockport and Cheshire East. Where the A555 crosses over the A34 in Stockport it is proposed that junction adaptations be implemented to facilitate and manage the anticipated traffic flows. The junction is proposed to be signalised and provide crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.

The A555/A34 is proposed to be upgraded with widened carriageways and traffic signal controls, including the introduction of controlled crossing facilities for pedestrian and cyclists. North of this junction, at the junction of the A34 and Stanley Road the roundabout is proposed to be upgraded to traffic signal control and increased lane capacity. Toucan crossing facilities for pedestrian and cyclists are proposed to be integrated into the signal controls for both junctions.

The existing A555 alignment continues west out of Stockport into Cheshire East under the existing at-grade separated dumb-bell junction linking to the B5358 (Wilmslow Road), where new west facing slip roads are proposed.

Between the B5358 Wilmslow Road, and the B5186 Styal Road, the proposal continues through Cheshire East passing through Styal Golf Course and agricultural land into Stockport. A bridleway quality bridge is proposed to divert the PRoW across the road at Yew Tree Farm. The proposal would then pass over Styal Railway Line in Stockport which is located in a deep cutting, and head into Manchester between the airport southern rail spur and Moss Nook electricity station.

At Styal Road, it is proposed that an at-grade signalised cross road arrangement incorporating Toucan facilities, for pedestrians and cyclists would be constructed requiring extensions to the existing road-over-rail bridge over the northern airport spur. From Styal Road, i.e. within the boundaries of the City Council, the proposal runs parallel to the airport rail spur where it is proposed to terminate as it merges at the existing Ringway Road/Ringway Road West junction west of Shadowmoss Road. Between Shadowmoss Road and the proposed main alignment, Ringway Road would be stopped up and a new layout arrangement with Shadowmoss Road constructed.

Overall, the proposal incorporates:

- Seven new road junctions (six of which are proposed in Stockport and one in Manchester);
- Modifications to four existing road junctions (three in Stockport and one in Cheshire East);
- Four new rail bridge crossings (three in Stockport and one in Manchester);
- Three new public right of way/accommodation bridges (two in Cheshire East and one in Stockport);
- Four new road bridges (three in Stockport and one in Cheshire East)
- A pedestrian and cycle route for the whole length of the relief road, including retrofitting it to the existing A555(Cheshire East and Stockport);
- Six balancing ponds for drainage purposes (four in Stockport, one in Cheshire East and one in Manchester, which is to be located south of Manchester International Office Centre;
- Associated landscaping, lighting, engineering and infrastructure works.

A plan of the whole A6MARR route, along with the element within Manchester is attached to this report for information.

### **Site and Surroundings**

The proposed alignment of the scheme traces the southern fringe of the Greater Manchester conurbation from the A6 in the east to Manchester Airport. The corridor of the scheme comprises a sequence of open space and countryside, much of which is designated as Green Belt and identified as a Landscape Character Areas of Lady Brook Valley and Woodford. The route of the scheme has been protected from development that would prejudice a road scheme within the corridor since the 1930's.

The land use pattern along the route is predominantly agricultural, however there is recreational and sports areas, institutional grounds and residential properties together with industrial and commercial uses.

From the A6 to the A555/Woodford Road Junction the corridor is characterised by open agricultural land used for grazing, the wooded valleys of Norbury Brook and Lady Brook and the urban areas of Hazel Grove to the north, Poynton to the south and Bramhall to the west.

The development is proposed to occupy the southern extent of Hazel Grove Golf Course (land outside of the operational golf course but within its ownership) and crossing Ox Hey Brook. The highway boundary and landscaping areas are proposed to abut a number of residential properties adjacent to the existing A6. From the A6, the alignment crosses the Hazel Grove Railway Line and runs through open fields passing between Norbury Brook and the southern extent of Old Mill Lane where it would pass in close proximity to residential dwellings. The proposed cycle path would abut with the boundary of the southern most residential property on Old Mill Lane. The scheme would pass to the south of residential properties on Darley Road and Ashbourne Road and would cross Macclesfield Road abutting with Brookside Garden Centre. The topography along this part of the route is gently undulating and at Norbury Brook the land is incised and slopes steeply downwards. A section of the wooded valley created by Norbury Brook is classified as ancient woodland.

The development would continue west through open pasture in parallel with the Ladybrook Valley Interest Trail and Norbury Brook and in close proximity to residential properties on Longnor Road, Sheldon Road, Norbury Hall, Mill Hill Hollow and Barlowfold Farm.

Ladybrook Valley is characterised by relatively steep sides. The scheme continues through open countryside and agricultural land of undulating topography, passing several public footpaths to the north and south before crossing Woodford Road and the West Coast Main Line. The scheme passes Hill Green Farm and Bramhall Golf Club to the north and Distaff Farm to the south.

The scheme continues south west through open agricultural land crossing several footpaths and the access road to Bramhall Oil Terminal and Ashmead Farm. The aforementioned are immediately to the north of the proposal with the settlement of Bramhall beyond the depot.

The proposal seeks consent to cross the northern extent of Moorend Golf Course before joining with the existing A555. There are residential properties to the north and south of Woodford Road and on Albany Road in close proximity with the scheme together with Queensgate School lying immediately to the north of the site.

The route continues along the existing A555 passing through relatively flat pasture with urban areas of Bramhall and Cheadle Hulme to the north. The scheme abuts with Woodford Recreational Ground to the north and Londfield Poultry Farm and Anderton's Nurseries to the south. The existing A555 crosses closely with residential properties associated with Hall Moss Lane. Between Hall Moss Lane and the A34 the A555 is mainly surrounded by open fields and Chester's Park Croft, a residential caravan park.

The scheme continues past the Stanley Green Trading Estate, the community of Handforth and residential properties on Stanley Road and Stanley Road Farm before passing under Wilmslow Road and approaching land currently occupied as Styal Golf Club. In this location there is outlying infrastructure associated with Manchester Airport, areas of pasture and the settlements of Handforth, Heald Green and Moss Nook.

Immediately to the west of Wilmslow Road, the proposed alignment crosses an existing airport storage facility and passes immediately to the south of Little Acorns Day Nursery. The proposal then continues back into open fields currently used for grazing livestock and the residential properties of Bolshaw farm.

A large residential dwelling known as 'The Grange' sits to the south of the proposed alignment with a large commercial nursery and two farms: Yew Tree Farm and Outwood Farm. Continuing west the proposal crosses a footpath before crossing the northern extent of Styal Gold Club. The scheme emerges to the west of the golf course into open fields used for grazing. The final section of the scheme within Stockport is where the scheme crosses the Styal Railway line. All land to the west of the Styal Railway Line falls within the City Council's boundaries, with the scheme predominantly tracing the Manchester Airport Railway line spurs through open fields near to residential and commercial properties in Moss Nook. The scheme terminates at the junction of Ringway Road/Ringway Road West.

### **Consultations and Notifications**

The planning application has been supported by a Statement of Community Involvement which identifies the full history and engagement of the public and stakeholders throughout the process.

The applicant has undertaken the following consultation prior to the submission of the application:

- Statutory and non-statutory consultees were engaged in 2009;
- Views and opinions from statutory and non-statutory consultees were sought in February 2010 on the revised scope of the ES.
- A series of forums for statutory and non-statutory consultees and interest groups were held between February 2012 and June 2012.
- Phase One Consultation - 18 public exhibitions were held throughout October, November and December 2012 across the length of the scheme. Exhibitions lasted for 2 days at each location, and were advertised via local radio, newspaper adverts, notifications on the website and leaflet drops to local residents. The purpose of the exhibitions was to engage with local residents and interested members of the public. Phase One asked broader questions about the proposed development in order to gauge overall support and preferences on the layout of six junctions along the proposed route.
- Specific consultation with affected land owners was undertaken throughout the summer of 2012.
- Phase Two Consultation - Following the first phase of public consultation, a revised scheme was prepared, taking into account the feedback received from the first phase of consultation, in particular in relation to the various junction options that had been previously consulted on. This was the subject of a further public consultation in June 2013. This phase provided feedback on the results of Phase One and sought views on the proposed development after taking on board the comments given in Phase One. Phase Two also provided feedback on proposed mitigation measures and highlighted the interventions

that have taken place to amend the Scheme in response to the feedback received, or where a change has not been possible, why this is the case.

The information and data captured by the applicant as part of the consultation process demonstrates that there was overall support for the proposed A6MARR. 69% of overall respondents supported the proposals with approximately 50% of respondents specifying that they are strongly in favour of the proposals. 13% of overall respondents specified that they were not in favour or definitely not in favour of the proposed development.

Following submission of the proposal the City Council issued 647 notification letters to local residents and businesses. The proposal has also been advertised in the Manchester Evening News and site notices have been erected throughout the site as the application is a major development, a departure from the development plan, affects public rights of way and was submitted with an Environmental Statement.

In response to the notification process carried out by the City Council, 21 responses have been received from members of the public and a business located within Stockport, the contents of which are outlined below.

The majority of the comments received from interested parties relate to principle of the scheme as a whole, as well as its impact upon communities outside of MCC's boundaries. However, for completeness all consultation/notification responses received by the City Council, whether or not they relate to any aspects of the element within its jurisdiction, are reproduced below.

**Members of the Public/Local Businesses** – Two letter of support has been received from members of the public, the contents of which is summarised below:

- The amount of traffic being forced to use Styal Rd/Ringway Rd is horrific, and at peak times is absolutely unbearable. The proposal will improve this situation.
- The proposal will improve the lives of children and adults in the residential areas of Heald Green and Hazel Grove as traffic that once travelled through these areas will utilise the new road.

One member of the public has made a comment on the proposal, stating that the cycling/walking route that runs alongside the proposal should be as continuous as possible, including where it needs to cross Styal Road and into the Manchester Airport site. The submitted plans suggest a multi-phased toucan crossing at the Styal Road junction which would not be cycle user-friendly.

The remaining 18 letters all raise objections to the proposal and the points raised are summarised below:

- The business forecast and traffic forecasts are based on a flawed model.
- The proposal will have a detrimental impact upon the business run at Robinson's Nurseries in Heald Green (tomato growing), due to the impact of dust and pollution on current air quality.

- The proposal will have an impact upon the countryside and wildlife habitat, including Ancient Woodland (Carr Wood, a 1000 year old bluebell wood) and SBIs. Bats, badgers and Great Crested Newts.
- New roads always create more traffic.
- There is very little green land left separating the Cheshire towns from the sprawl of Manchester, and this road will destroy a large amount of it. The effect will be devastating, both to local people and local wildlife.
- The proposal is clearly not a 'relief' road and is there to serve disproportionately-powerful aviation and construction industries.
- The increase in noise and pollution, and reduction in green space, are all detrimental to people's health and quality of life.
- There are issues of flooding.
- The alternatives to this scheme have not been properly assessed, including investment in public transport infrastructure to link Stockport to the airport, and to reduce congestion on the A6.
- The scheme will worsen air quality in an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), in contravention of EU's Air Quality Directive.
- The A6 at Disley is an AQMA and this scheme would bring an extra 9000 vehicles a day along the A6 at that point - an increase of over 50%.
- The scheme will lead to increased carbon emissions, in direct conflict with Greater Manchester's Climate Change Strategy (which has set a target to reduce emissions by 48% by 2020) and the Climate Change Act (which sets a legally binding target to cut emissions by 80% by 2050).
- The proposal will divide the Green Belt between Clay Lane, Handforth, and Heald Green, in half.
- The proposal will increase traffic northbound from Handforth on the A34 by 50% (their figures, again) from 2,000 peak-hour cars to 3,000.

**Prestbury Parish Council** – The parish council do not support the way in which road building is being carried out contrary to government guidance on how transport infrastructure should be appraised. The parish council raise concern with regards to the scheme and wish to understand what the full impact on the parish would be if:

- The A6MARR is built
- The A6MARR and Poynton Bypass is built
- All the SEMMMS roads are built; and
- All the SEMMMS roads and all the other strategic routes in the Cheshire East pre submission Core Strategy are built.

They raise concern with regards to the Local Enterprise Partnerships and the impacts that development could have on Prestbury. They advise that new roads invariably attract development along them, and state that all the SEMMMS schemes are within the Green Belt.

The state that it has been apparent for some time that if any part of the SEMMMS network is constructed, it would automatically trigger the building of the remainder of the network, part of which is scheduled to pass through Prestbury.

They raise concern that the SEMMMS Study endorsed the road schemes based on a very high growth rate in traffic which they advise has not materialised, and have in fact flattened out and since declined.

Concern is raised that no business case of traffic modelling is available for the remaining SEMMMS schemes or other schemes proposed in Cheshire East.

They consider that the Department for Communities and Local Government should call in the planning application for the A6MARR and hold a Public Inquiry in order that all issues surround this and the connecting roads and nearby settlements can be properly and exhaustively examined.

**Campaign for the Protect Rural England (CPRE)** – CPRE Lancashire Branch continues to uphold its objection to the SEMMMS A6-Manchester Airport Relief Road because it is unsustainable, it is not in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework or the Climate Change Act and no up-to-date evidence has been presented which makes an unequivocal case for it.

CPRE believes that the planning authorities involved in promoting the SEMMMS network of roads must present an up to date and robust evidence base to inform a coordinated and strategic transport plan that positively justifies the delivery of a variety of transport solutions. Sustainable transport and active travel modes (light and heavy rail, bus, cycling and walking) should be catered for and applied first, along with soft measures/ smart choices, in order to achieve modal shift and ensure an improved integrated transport system. The building of new roads and the provision of extra highway capacity should be seen as a last option after all other approaches have failed. The traffic modelling that provides the evidence base for the existing scheme is weak, as it is primarily founded on predictions from over a decade ago that were based on high growth scenarios which have never materialised in reality.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. The transport section starts with a call to 'balance the transport system in favour of sustainable transport modes. For clarity, this means sustainable transport modes or any efficient, safe and accessible means of transport with overall low impact on the environment. One of the NPPF's twelve core planning principles calls for planning bodies to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable. CPRE endorses this NPPF core planning principle.

In addition, the NPPF is clear about the need to uphold Green Belt principles, key amongst which is the requirement to prevent urban sprawl. If the A6-Manchester Airport Relief Road were built, it would facilitate the closing up of the Green Belt between Greater Manchester and settlements in Cheshire East. The Green Belt divide in this area is particularly fragile and new roads invariably attract new developments along them.

**Cheshire Wildlife Trust (CWT)** – CWT have stated that in general they do not wholly object to the proposal. However, there are certain elements about which the CWT has serious concerns and it is considered that these should be addressed by the applicant prior to determination or in response to a planning condition, whichever is more appropriate.

*n.b. the majority of the CWT's concerns centre around elements of the scheme outside of the City Council's boundaries. However, clarification has been sought from CWT in order to confirm whether or not they consider the element within Manchester has the potential to impact upon wildlife. Their response will be reported at the committee.*

**Manchester Green Party** – The Green Party object to the proposal on the following grounds:

- It is not compatible with the principles expressed in statutory local and national planning documents.
- The benefits referred to in the consultation leaflet (economic growth, less traffic on local roads, improved safety etc) are by no means certain. Has it been considered that any growth at the Airport will draw employment and retail spend away from neighbourhood centres. This is likely to result in little overall growth but increase the need for employees to travel greater distances.
- The proposed road would be contrary to several Manchester Core Strategy policies and aims on sustainable transport, climate change and air quality, namely policies T1 and EN16.
- The proposed relief road is contrary to the NPPF principles in that it does not jointly and simultaneously achieve economic, social and environmental gain; does not align with several NPPF core planning principles, in particular by effectively implementing the least sustainable SEMMMS recommendation before those which are sustainable transport modes; does not secure reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and is not based on up to date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics of the area and country.

**Friends of the Earth (Manchester)** – Object to the proposal as they do not believe that the case has been made for the economic, environmental and transport benefit claims as put forward in the planning application.

They consider the scheme would have a wide range of detrimental environmental, economic and social impacts that contradict national objectives and legal obligations and believe that the three Local Planning Authorities have a legal obligation under European and UK air quality and climate change legislation to refuse planning permission for the scheme.

They question the scope of the proposed scheme and believe that it is unacceptable that alternative options including a public transport improvement and cycling and pedestrian infrastructure only option, without the A6MARR, have not been considered.

They consider that there are flaws in the traffic modelling and traffic generation forecasts and question why significant sums of public money should be spent on a scheme which they do not believe would contribute towards lowering carbon emissions, and would in their opinion lead to an increase.

Manchester Friends of the Earth raise concern with regards to air quality and air pollution in general, state the requirements of the UK as a whole and highlight areas of the scheme which are of concern. Within Manchester, they have highlighted that specific areas in Wythenshawe will see an increase in noise levels and that air quality in those areas may be affected due to increases in the amount of traffic travelling through the area. They highlight the particulate matter levels (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) have not been assessed in the EIA. Air quality impacts have been cited as a reason when the Highways Agency are not proposing to allow hard shoulder running on the M60 J8-18.

The response highlights the levels of traffic and states that 'the A6MARR scheme does little to reduce AM and PM peak congestions – in fact the scheme makes peak congestion worse and has major increases in some specific areas – which raise serious concerns in relation to air pollution'.

The response further identifies climate change legislation and questions the accuracy of traffic modelling and further state that they believe the SMBC, MCC and CEC have a legal obligation under European and UK air quality and climate change legislation to refuse planning permission for the proposed road scheme.

**Friends of the Earth (Stockport) – Object to the proposal on the following grounds:**

- The proposal will attract fracking to the area.
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact upon air quality and wildlife.
- Proposes that an alternative approach to the scheme would recognise the merits of local transport networks. Comprehensive cycling facilities, improved pedestrian routes and better bus services with affordable fares encourage people to use cars less, or not at all, and to patronise local businesses.

**Friends of the Earth – Objects to the proposal on the following grounds:**

- The proposal is inconsistent with the need to mitigate climate change emissions,
- The proposal is inconsistent with the need to reduce air pollution in line with EU air quality standards, resulting in risk to human health including vulnerable communities.
- The proposal is inconsistent with the need to protect biodiversity and nature conservation.
- The proposal will have an adverse impacts contrary to NPPF and local planning policy.
- There has been inadequate consideration and consultation on all options to reduce congestion, while also tackling air pollution and climate change, including non-road solutions.

- There is a lack of an up-to-date review on the need for the scheme as it is over a decade since the first SEMMMS proposals.
- The road will increase air pollution in a number of residential areas across the scheme and significantly in the Greater Manchester and Disley AQMA where pollution levels already exceed NO<sub>2</sub> limits.
- A precedent has been set by the Highways Agency decision not to proceed with hard shoulder running on the M60 on air pollution grounds and the Supreme Court ruling that the UK is in breach of the Air Quality Directive.
- The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report issued a stark warning on the urgency and scale of action required to reduce carbon emissions and avoid dangerous climate change. Rather than contributing towards an 80% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by 2050, the scheme is forecast to deliver an increase in emissions.

### **North West Transport Roundtable and the Campaign for Better Transport –**

Object to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The plan to build this road runs contrary to all good sense and a mounting volume of evidence.
- The concept has no environmental credentials and will have any number of negative effects that will impinge on quality of life in south east Manchester/ north east Cheshire.

In their submission in objecting to the scheme they consider that they demonstrate:

- Traffic growth has been flattening out and falling both nationally and in the wider SEMMMS area for some years, cancelling out the argument for road building;
- There are flaws in many of the assumptions behind the transport forecasts;
- There are many questionable aspects to the modelling which did not examine a sufficiently wide geographical area and failed to model walking and cycling;
- Economic modelling has been overly optimistic and speculative and the economic case is still unproven;
- The health benefit assessment is wrong to assume there would be more benefits than disbenefits from the scheme based on assertions about economic opportunities;
- Properly conductive tests on alternative road building were not carried out
- The scheme will not meet its objectives;
- Modal split in the target area is already dominated by car and will not be helped;
- Insufficient attention has been paid to air pollution and knock-on health impacts;
- Overall, harmful emissions will rise, breaching EU standards;

- Building the road will, in effect, drive a horse and cart through sustainability and carbon reduction plans & policies the promoting authorities are signed up to;
- The impact of increased noise and pollution as well as air pollution is likely to have a real detrimental effect on people's health;
- The big population within easy access to rolling countryside would lose a precious and very convenient resource on the urban fringe;
- The Green Belt will be breached between Greater Manchester and Cheshire East.

**Environmental Health** – Suggests the imposition of conditions designed to protect residential amenity during the construction process.

**Strategic Development Team** – Support the proposal as it is required to improve accessibility to Manchester Airport and M56 motorway from key parts of south Manchester.

**Highways Services** – The Local Highway Authority (LHA) supports the principle of the A6 MARR link given the benefits it will bring to the wider area. However, there are a number of points that require clarification and also a number of details that require amending. The LHA is working with the applicant to address the points of detail and to obtain clarification where this is required. Subject to the points of detail being addressed and the necessary clarification provided, the LHA have no objections to the proposal.

**Neighbourhood Team Leader (Arboriculture)** – No objections from an arboricultural perspective as the benefits of the development will out-way the potential loss of trees in this area. Added to this, the mitigation planting will more than compensate for the loss of the trees indicated and the creation of various habitats will greatly benefit the local wildlife.

**Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)** – The A6MARR is a transport priority for Greater Manchester and TfGM has been working with the City Council and SMBC to secure its delivery. TfGM have been involved in the detailed design of the interface between the road scheme and the Airport Metrolink extension and its associated works.

Should the City Council be minded to approve the proposal, due to the proximity of the proposed development to the Metrolink network TfGM would recommend that a condition requiring the submission of a construction management plan be attached to any consent granted.

**Manchester Airport Group (MAG)** – MAG are long standing supporters of the scheme, which has existed for decades and express their support for the proposal and have stated that:

- MAG have been an active participant in the SEMMMS and have actively invested in its delivery, most notably the substantial investment in public

transport improvements, the airport inter-change, third rail platform and a contribution to the Metrolink extension.

- The highway scheme is one of the missing pieces of the transport investment jigsaw.
- Safe, convenient and reliable access from all parts of the catchment area is a necessary pre-requisite to fully exploiting the potential the Airport brings.
- The road scheme will significantly improve access to the Airport from the east for air passengers, staff, service partners and inbound visitors.
- Growth of the Airport and improvements in access to it are a consistent feature of national, regional and local policy.

Notwithstanding this strong support MAG do have some detailed comments to make on the suggested route and design:

- From Styal Road to Shadowmoss Road the scheme takes land which is under MAG control. This land lies within the approved Airport Operational Area and is part of the land designed to meet future airport growth. While some loss of land to improve access has always been known, it is urged that the land take is kept to a minimum and that alignment enables MAG to make full and efficient use of the remaining areas.
- There will be significant benefits in terms of journey time, convenience, operational efficiency and importantly removing traffic from the strategic networks, if there is a direct access from the A6MARR to the recently approved 9,000 space car park located off Shadowmoss Road.

**Aerodrome Safeguarding** – Despite making references to aerodrome safeguarding in the supporting documentation, it is not clear within the material how these matters have been addressed in the design of the scheme. Therefore a considerable amount of additional detailed information will be required to enable full aerodrome safeguarding assessments of the proposal.

In the absence of a fully detailed safeguarding assessment, Manchester Airport have requested that a number of conditions be attached to any approval granted. These conditions will require the applicant to submit details of the proposed lighting columns, signage, Styal Road airport spur bridge, landscaping (bird strike hazard), runway approach lighting and the use of cranes.

**Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service (GMAAS)** – No archaeological remains have been identified which are of potential national significance. Sites affected by the scheme range from local to regional potential significance and therefore it is acceptable that they can be disturbed by development ground works as long as an appropriate record is made through an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation which is subject to a planning condition.

**Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU)** – It is acknowledged that significant information has been provided regarding ecological impacts, though there is concerns over the detail of the ecological assessment and for this reason a number of conditions are suggested which will require the applicants to undertake additional survey work. It is not felt likely that any potential ecological constraints will emerge

from these additional surveys and the additional information should simply inform the level of mitigation required.

**Natural England** – It is considered that this application does not pose any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment for which Natural England would otherwise provide a more detailed consultation response (SSSI, Natura 2000 sites, National Parks and AONB), as a result it does not wish to make specific comment on the details of this consultation.

**English Heritage (NW Region)** – It is not believed that the proposal causes harm to the setting of highly graded listed buildings (grade II\* and I), grade II\* or I registered parks and gardens or the site of scheduled monuments within the zone of visual influence.

The proposal is likely to have direct physical impacts upon archaeology along the proposed route and as a result GMAAS should be consulted to assess the archaeological potential of the route and in the preparation of an archaeological mitigation strategy.

**The Highways Agency** – The Agency does not wish to raise any objections to the principle of the A6MARR being granted planning permission.

The line of the A6MARR overlaps with the current Route Protection in place under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the Poynton Bypass to Manchester Airport Eastern Link Road (West) (MAELR (w)). Under Article 26 b(iv) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010 the Agency have confirmed, on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport, that it does not propose to issue any direction and will liaise with MCC to agree a mutually convenient date for the Route Protection to be formally removed.

**Environment Agency** – No objection in principle to the proposed development. The proposed development will only meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework if the measures detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment from AECOM (ref. 1007/6.7/061 Rev 5, dated 02/10/2013), are implemented and secured by way of a planning condition on any planning permission.

**Network Rail** – No objections to the proposal.

**National Grid** – National Grid has identified that it has apparatus in the vicinity of the proposed site which may be affected by the development.

**United Utilities** – No objections to the proposal providing conditions regarding drainage, landscaping and building within close proximity of public sewers and existing service reservoirs are attached to any approval granted.

## **Issues**

**The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** – The NPPF was published on the 27th March 2012 and replaces and revokes a number of Planning Policy

Guidance (PPGs) and Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) previously produced by Central Government. The NPPF constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and decision-makers both in drawing up plans and as a material consideration in determining planning applications. It does not change the statutory status of the development plan, i.e. the Core Strategy, as the starting point for decision making and it states further that development that accords with an up-to-date local plan, such as the Core Strategy, should be approved unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Manchester Core Strategy was adopted on 11th July 2012 after having been found to be sound after an Examination in Public. It represents the most up to date planning policy position as will be outlined later on in this report.

The NPPF states that the planning system must contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and that there are three dimensions to this: economic, social and environmental.

It has introduced a set of Core Principle that should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking, these 12 principles are that planning should:

- Be genuinely plan-led,
- Not simply about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve places,
- Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, businesses/industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs,
- Always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity,
- Take account of the different roles and character of different areas,
- Support the transition to a low carbon future,
- Contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution,
- Encourage the effective use of land,
- Promote mixed use developments,
- Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance,
- Actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable,
- Take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well being for all.

The main policies/statements set out in the NPPF which are relevant to this proposal are as follows:

Paragraph 31 states that Local Authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges, roadside facilities for motorists or transport investment necessary to support strategies for the growth of ports, airports or other major generators of travel demand in their areas.

Paragraph 41 states that Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to wide transport choice.

Paragraph 79 states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belt and that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belt are their openness and their permanence.

Paragraph 80 expands on this further by stating that Green Belt serves five purposes:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up area;
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- To reserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Paragraph 87-88 continues stating that as with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. This policy reiterates previous Green Belt policy and states that when considering planning applications, LPAs should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, and that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 90 further states that development may not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and includes 'engineering operations' and 'local transport infrastructure' which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location, provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

Paragraph 103 advises that determining planning applications, LPAs should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere and only consider development appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where, informed by a site-specific flood risk assessment following the Sequential and Exception Test, it can be demonstrated that:

- within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location; and
- development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including safe access and escape routes where required, and that any residual risk can be safely managed, including emergency planning; and it gives priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems.

Paragraph 109 – The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;
- recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
- minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;
- preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.

Paragraph 118 states that when determining planning LPAs should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles:

- if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
- proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) likely to have an adverse effect on a SSSI (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted.
- opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged.

Paragraph 123 states that planning policies and decisions should aim to:

- avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse effects on health and quality of life as a result of new development;
- mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from new development;
- recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established; and
- identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.

Paragraph 132 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.

Paragraph 135 states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application.

Paragraphs 186 and 187 state that LPAs should approach decision-taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development and should look for

solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with these aims and objectives.

**Core Strategy Development Plan Document** – The Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 -2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012. It is the key document in Manchester's Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy replaces significant elements of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as the document that sets out the long term strategic planning policies for Manchester's future development.

A number of UDP policies have been saved until replaced by further development plan documents to accompany the Core Strategy. Planning applications in Manchester must be decided in accordance with the Core Strategy, saved UDP policies and other Local Development Documents unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Relevant policies in the Core Strategy are outlined below:

Policy SP1, *Spatial Principles* – This states that the key spatial principles which will guide the strategic development of Manchester to 2027 are:

- The Regional Centre will be the focus for economic and commercial development, retail, leisure and cultural activity, alongside high quality city living.
- The growth of Manchester Airport will act as a catalyst for the regional economy, and will also provide the impetus for a second hub of economic activity in this part of the City.
- Beyond these areas, the emphasis is on the creation of neighbourhoods of choice, providing high quality and diverse housing around district centres which meet local needs, all in a distinct environment. The majority of new residential development in these neighbourhoods will be in the Inner Areas, defined by the North Manchester, East Manchester and Central Manchester Regeneration Areas.
- The City is covered by regeneration areas including the City Centre. All development should have regard to the character, issues and strategy for each regeneration area as described in the North, East, Central and South Manchester and Wythenshawe Strategic Regeneration Frameworks and the Manchester City Centre Strategic Plan.
- The City's network of open spaces will provide all residents with good access to recreation opportunities. The River Valleys (the Irk, Medlock and Mersey) and City Parks are particularly important, and access to these resources will be improved.
- New development will maximise the potential of the City's transport infrastructure, in particular promoting walking, cycling and use of the public transport. The extension to the Metrolink network through the Oldham and Ashton lines will create key corridors for new development.

Policy DM1, *Development Management* – This policy states that all development should have regard to a number of specific issues for which more detailed guidance may be given within a supplementary planning document. In this instance it is considered that the most relevant are as follows:

- Appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail.
- Impact on the surrounding areas in terms of the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development.
- Effects on amenity, including privacy, light, noise, vibration, air quality, odours, litter, vermin, birds, road safety and traffic generation. This could also include proposals which would be sensitive to existing environmental conditions, such as noise.
- Accessibility: buildings and neighbourhoods fully accessible to disabled people, access to new development by sustainable transport modes.
- Community safety and crime prevention.
- Design for health.
- Vehicular access and car parking.
- Effects relating to biodiversity, landscape, archaeological or built heritage.
- Green Infrastructure including open space, both public and private.
- Flood risk and drainage.

Policy DM 2, *Aerodrome Safeguarding* – This policy states that development that would affect the operational integrity or safety of Manchester Airport or Manchester Radar will not be permitted.

Policy EN1, *Design Principles and Strategic Character Areas* – This policy states of the “Airport & urban fringe Character Area” that much of this area is open in character, including a significant area of agricultural land. It states further that built development is mainly associated with the Airport and associated uses, often large scale but height limited by flight path requirements and that other built development is small scale and takes the form of individual or small clusters of houses. This element of the policy concludes by stating that development in this area needs to accommodate the future operational needs of the Airport, whilst retaining the areas open character as far as is possible.

Policy EN9, *Green Infrastructure* – This policy states that new development will be expected to maintain existing green infrastructure in terms of its quantity, quality and multiple function. Where the opportunity arises and in accordance with current Green Infrastructure Strategies the City Council will encourage developers to enhance the quality and quantity of green infrastructure, improve the performance of its functions and create and improve linkages to and between areas of green infrastructure.

Where the benefits of a proposed development are considered to outweigh the loss of an existing element of green infrastructure, the developer will be required to demonstrate how this loss will be mitigated in terms of quantity, quality, function and future management.

Policy EN13, *Green Belt* – This policy states that the extent of Green Belt in Manchester will be amended in the vicinity of Manchester Airport, in accordance with policy MA1.

Policy EN14, *Flood Risk* – This policy states that all new development should minimise surface water run-off, including through Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) and the use of Green Infrastructure.

Policy EN15, *Biodiversity and Geological Conservation* – This policy states that the City Council will seek to maintain or enhance sites of biodiversity and geological value throughout the City and that particular consideration will be given to:

- sites with international or national designations for their biodiversity value.
- other sites of biodiversity value.
- priority habitats found within Manchester.
- protected and priority species.
- sites that are recognised for their geological importance.
- the Council's objective to protect and conserve the City's existing trees and woodlands.

Policy EN16, *Air Quality* – This policy states that the City Council will seek to improve the air quality within Manchester, and particularly within Air Quality Management Areas, located along Manchester's principal traffic routes and at Manchester Airport.

Policy EN17, *Water Quality* – This policy states that with reference to the Manchester-Salford-Trafford SFRA and other relevant documents:

- Development should avoid any adverse impact on water quality, including during the construction phase, and wherever possible should seek to enhance water quality.
- Development should minimise surface water run-off and maximise the use of appropriate sustainable drainage systems, to minimise groundwater contamination, and to avoid pollutants reaching watercourses.

Policy T 1, *Sustainable Transport* – This policy states that to deliver a sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system to encourage modal shift away from car travel to public transport, cycling and walking, to support the needs of residents and businesses and to prepare for carbon free modes of transport, the City Council will support proposals that: -

- Improve choice by developing alternatives to the car.
- Promote regeneration and economic vitality by relieving traffic congestion and improving access to jobs and services, particularly for those most in need and for those without a car.
- Improve access to transport services and facilities in order to enable disabled people and people with mobility impairments to participate fully in public life.
- Improve pedestrian routes and the pedestrian environment.
- Improve and develop further Manchester's cycle network.

- Contribute to improvements to the extent and reliability of the public transport network through safe and attractive waiting and interchange facilities, better priority, improved services and information provision.
- Improve and develop appropriate road, rail and water freight transport routes and associated intermodal freight transport facilities in order to assist in the sustainable and efficient movement of goods.
- Would reduce the negative impacts of road traffic, for example, congestion, air pollution and road accident casualties.

Policy T 2 , *Accessible areas of opportunity and need* – This policy states that the City Council will actively manage the pattern of development to ensure that new development:

Particular priority will be given to providing all residents access to strategic employment sites including:-

- Maintaining strong links between residential areas in the South and the Regional Centre and improving connectivity with the Airport.
- Ensuring good links between Wythenshawe residents and the Airport and further employment opportunities in Stockport, Trafford and the Regional Centre.

Extant UDP policy DC22.1, *Footpath Protection* – This policy states that in considering development proposals, the City Council will have regard to the effect on existing pedestrian routes and will not normally allow development which would result in unacceptable inconvenience to local pedestrian movement.

Extant UDP policy DC26.1, *Development and Noise* – This policy states that the Council will consider both the effect of new development proposals which are likely to be generators of noise; and the implications of new development being exposed to existing noise sources which are effectively outside planning control.

For reasons to be outlined below, it is considered the proposal accords with these policies.

**Environmental Impact Assessment** – The applicant has submitted an Environmental Statement in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011.

During the EIA process the applicant has considered an extensive range of potential environmental effects in consultation with the City Council, SMBC, CEC and a variety of statutory consultees. As a result of this scoping exercise it was considered that the issues that could give rise to significant impact are:

- Air Quality
- Cultural Heritage
- Landscape and Visual Effects
- Nature Conservation
- Geology and Soils

- Noise and Vibration
- Effects on All Travellers
- Community and Private Assets
- Road Drainage and the Water Environment
- Cumulative Effects

These issues will be covered below.

**Principle of the Proposal** – The proposed development is an integral component of the wider SEMMMS, a twenty year integrated transport strategy for the study area aimed at addressing transport problems in the area (chiefly congestion) on a multi-modal basis. The SEMMMS study, published in 2001, identified that whilst congestion was the biggest single problem with the transport system of South East Manchester, there were many other problems, which included but were not limited to:

- the quality and extent of the public transport network;
- the patterns of land-use that had developed over the last twenty years in the study area;
- the particular transport needs of areas of social deprivation, these being quite different to those of the more affluent parts of the study area; and
- study area residents expectations and aspirations for personal mobility.

The Study subsequently recommended that, amongst a package of other measures, including investment in the public transport network (bus and rail, including Metrolink), local authorities develop smaller and more appropriate scale road proposals along the protected alignments. The study recommended that these roads should be designed to provide relief for the study area communities affected by inappropriate through traffic, but not to provide a new strategic route of regional and potentially national significance.

The A6MARR is considered critical to delivering the long-term objectives of SEMMMS. Once constructed and operational, the A6MARR development aims to alleviate a number of existing social and economic constraints, including:

- Poor connectivity along the south Manchester corridor; with a fragmented east-west highway network and lack of surface access to Manchester Airport, which currently acts as a barrier to economic growth and regeneration;
- Congestion on the local and strategic network; in particular along the A6 and in the urban centres of Gatley, Bramhall, Heald Green, Hazel Grove, Poynton, Wilmslow, Handforth and Cheadle Hulme;
- Poor environmental conditions in the District and Local Centres along the south Manchester corridor, caused by the high volume of traffic passing through these towns to reach other destinations; and
- Unsatisfactory conditions for pedestrians and cyclists through busy urban areas along the extent of the south Manchester corridor, with all non-motorised transport users facing severance and problems of safely accessing education, employment and leisure facilities.

Addressing these problems will bring benefits to the local population and businesses and to the wider economy by:

- providing efficient surface access and improved connectivity and thus increasing employment and generating economic growth;
- boosting business integration and productivity; reducing the impact of traffic congestion on local businesses and communities;
- reducing severance and improving accessibility to, from and between key centres of economic and social activity;
- reallocating road space and improving facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport; and
- improving the safety of road users, pedestrians and cyclists by reducing the volume of through-traffic from residential areas and retail centres.

The contents and objectives of the SEMMMS study were endorsed across the North West at all political levels (and at central government level), with strong public support for the multimodal package of measures. The need for the A6MARR as a particular outcome of SEMMMS has also been recognised and supported. The scheme is supported by local MPs, and all three major political parties in each of the Local Authorities through which the road passes. It is also supported by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) and TfGM. The GMCA have prioritised the scheme for inclusion in the Greater Manchester Transport Fund, and a contribution from this fund will be used to part-fund the scheme. The proposed development has been identified by Central Government as one of a number of nationally important infrastructure projects, which are required to revitalise the economy and £165 million of Central Government funding has been allocated for the delivery of the scheme.

In light of the above it is considered that the principle of the proposal is acceptable. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the potential impacts of the proposal must be analysed.

**Impact on the Green Belt** – An element of the site in Manchester is within the Green Belt and as such any impact upon it must be assessed.

The NPPF states in paragraph 90 that certain forms of development are not inappropriate development provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. The forms of development specified include both ‘engineering operation’ and ‘local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location’. Considered in isolation there is a strong argument that the element of the proposal inappropriate development and therefore justification of “very special circumstances” would not be required, given a) the nature of the proposal and b) openness of the Green Belt would not be impacted upon.

However, it is considered on balance that the development as a whole would be harmful to openness and would not safeguard existing areas of countryside from encroachment. The applicant has therefore concluded that the development is ‘inappropriate development’ and as such, provided “very special circumstances” which they believe outweigh any harm to the Green Belt.

The applicant has cited that:

- the proposed new road facilitates important economic growth;
- building the new road ensure the delivery of key components of SEMMMS; and
- development within the Green Belt is considered to be the only option for the A6MARR component of SEMMMS.

The fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, with their essential characteristics being their openness and permanence. Whilst the proposal would result in development within the Green Belt, and as such, the road would have an urbanising impact, concerns relating to the scheme opening up development land cannot be supported or justified. The element of the site within the City Council's boundaries is enclosed or bisected by railway lines and little developable land would remain following the construction of the A6MARR. The rationale behind the proposal is to promote economic growth by providing transport infrastructure, and not to promote development along the route. The scheme is considered to have been sympathetically designed to follow the general contours of land, and is partially located within cuttings, limiting where possible the visual impact above ground.

The proposal has been designed to address existing high levels of congestion on the local road network, and would lead to shorter journey times for all modes of transport and improved road safety, especially for pedestrians and cyclist within existing residential areas. Existing transport links across south-east Greater Manchester and Cheshire East are contributing to traffic congestion on major and minor roads resulting in inefficient, indirect and difficult movement of people and goods. The existing situation is considered to be constraining the local economy, affecting air quality and limiting access to key destinations.

The building of the road would deliver a key component of SEMMMS, and whilst not a justification in its own right to allow development in the Green Belt, it is considered to add weight to the argument especially as it supports the Governments initiative to 'Keep Britain Moving' and support the delivery of the Local Transport Plans in the area and Greater Manchester Strategy.

The location of the scheme within the Green Belt has been considered as the only option to facilitate meeting the aims and objectives of the scheme, and providing the required need. A significant proportion of land located towards the south of Manchester is designated Green Belt, and therefore, by definition, any road alignment in the locality to serve the need would be located within the Green Belt.

Having regard to the NPPF and whilst accepting the development as a whole should be classed as inappropriate development due to its impacts, it is considered that the applicant has demonstrated "very special circumstances" for development in the location. Furthermore, it is not considered that the development would set a precedent for future development along its corridor, and therefore the remaining

Green Belt can be protected in accordance with policy. There is also no evidence that the development could attract fracking into the area.

Taking account of the above, the scheme would represent development which by definition is harmful to the Green Belt, however, due to the “very special circumstances” identified would not justify refusal of the application.

**Visual Amenity** – The applicants’ assessment of any impact on visual amenity has focused on:

- likely impacts on the landscape character of the urban areas, urban fringe and countryside associated with the proposed scheme corridor between the A6 and Manchester Airport; and
- visual impacts on sensitive receptors associated with the proposed scheme corridor between the A6 and Manchester Airport;

For the purposes of determining this application, only the impact upon the element of the scheme within Manchester will be assessed.

Landscape Character - The site of the whole proposal has been subdivided into Local Landscape Character Areas (LLCAs), the one within Manchester being designated as *LLCA - F - Moss Nook*. This LLCA is small in comparison with the other areas and is bordered to the north by Simonsway, in the east by the existing railway line and extensive planting bordering the adjoining *LLCA-E Heald Green / Handforth Fringe*, to the south by the northern edge of Moss Lane and to the west by the open expanse of Manchester Airport.

One of the key features of the area is the frequency and scale of the communication routes that converge in the area as road and rail links extend in a north-south and east-west direction linking to the airport and extensive suburbs of Wythenshawe. These transport corridors result in a fragmented landscape framework with remnants of field boundaries and hedgerow trees.

The remaining open areas are made up of a mosaic of glasshouses, nurseries and the remnants of agricultural land still used for grazing. Development has mainly occurred along the main road links in a series of residential ribbon developments extending from the junction of Styal Road with Ringway Road West to result in a limited appreciation of the agricultural landscape beyond the local development.

The area’s landscape structure has been eroded and interrupted primarily by the development of roads, rail corridors and the encroachment of airport related activity resulting in a lack of cohesion. Access via footpaths and bridleways is limited within the north of area however its proximity to an extensive urban area gives it some value at a very local level as a recreational resource. The area is already heavily urbanised and as such is capable of accommodating further change of the type proposed, as a result the area’s sensitivity to change is ‘low’.

Changes to the landscape character within *LLCA - F - Moss Nook* will be moderate as the proposal would be located within an already heavily modified landscape that

comprises existing transport corridors. The proposed junction with Styal Road will result in a modification to the existing road layout although the magnitude of impact is not anticipated to be significant. To the west the proposed scheme lies immediately adjacent to the existing rail corridor, though several hedgerows will be severed.

Mitigation measures will provide planting either side of the proposed road gradually providing screening and introducing extensive belts of low level planting. Mitigation measures are restricted within the vicinity of Manchester Airport to reduce high level planting that will provide cover for birds and thus increase the risk of bird strikes.

Key mitigation measures in this area will comprise of:

- shrub planting between the alignment and railway line aimed at replacing existing planting removed by the construction of the new road, and
- inclusion of a screen fence and narrow belt of planting to the outer edge to provide a visual screen to dwellings on Ringway Road West.

This area's ability to accommodate change is in high due to the existing network of communication links and fragmented landscape pattern. Overall the magnitude of impact will be in the order of low/moderate as the road will be a perceptible new element within the local landscape character. The impact at the year of opening will be slight/moderate adverse, reducing to slight adverse once the mitigation measures have matured.

Visual Impacts - The assessment of visual effects has involved the identification of areas along the route of the proposal from which it is anticipated the road, associated structures and design features, along with traffic using it, will potentially appear in existing views and the extent to which this will be detrimental or beneficial to the receptors affected. The principal receptors in this area comprise of:

- a mixture of properties along Ringway Road.
- terraced and semi detached properties to the edge of Woodhouse Park including; Shadowmoss Lane, Carsdale Road, Thornsgreen Road, Lincombe Road.
- office blocks forming Manchester Business Park.
- public Right of Way

Given this, the applicants undertook a study of the site from the following nine viewpoints:

- 1) 15-29 (odds) Shadowmoss Road
- 2) 22,24,26 Swithin Road
- 3) 35-45 (odds) Carsdale Road
- 4) 38-46 Carsdale Road
- 5) 1,3,5,7,10,12 Lynside Walk, 22-36 (evens) Carsdale Road
- 6) Office blocks, Aviator Way
- 7) 28-32 (evens) Swithin Road
- 8) 1,3,5 Copgrove Walk
- 9) The Airport Hotel PH

The results of this visual impact assessment have revealed that only one of these receptors (no. 3) will be subject to a *moderate/large adverse* impact during the construction of the proposal and that three of the receptors (nos. 3, 4 and 5) will be subject to either a *moderate adverse* or *moderate/slight adverse* impact in the winter during the year of opening. In the long term, i.e. 15 years, the impact of the proposal upon the nine viewpoints is broken down as follows:

- 3 x *slight adverse*
- 1 x *slight adverse/moderate*
- 2 x *neutral/slight adverse*
- 1 x *neutral /slight beneficial*
- 2 x *neutral*

In light of the above assessment whilst it is acknowledged that there would be a range of impacts on visual amenity it is not considered that the proposal would have so significant an impact upon existing levels of visual amenity enjoyed within the vicinity of the site to warrant refusal of the proposals given the wider benefits that they will bring as set out within this report.

**Residential Amenity** – The impact of the proposal in terms of air quality (dust and vehicle emissions), noise and vibration has been undertaken, both in terms of construction and the operation of the road itself.

Air Quality - The assessments for air quality have been focused on:

- local air quality associated with parts of the road network where volumes of traffic would be affected by the introduction of the proposed scheme into the network;
- changes in concentrations of oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) and levels of nitrogen deposition where changes in volumes of traffic within the road network affected by the introduction of the proposed scheme into the network could potentially affect sites designated for their ecological value;
- changes in greenhouse gas emissions (regional emissions) attributable to the introduction of the proposed scheme into the local road network;
- nuisance associated with construction related dust; and
- impacts on local air quality associated with construction traffic.

The applicants have undertaken surveys of the levels of mono-nitrogen oxides (NO and NO<sub>2</sub>) and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>) currently experienced by the residents of those properties nearest to the proposed road alignment, namely those on Ringway Road and the culs-de sac off them and the dwellings on Styal Road and Tedder Drive.

These readings reveal the following existing NO<sub>2</sub> levels:

- the residents of Ringway Road experience the highest reading of greater than 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (micrograms per cubic metre),
- the dwellings on Croyde Close and Wynfield Avenue experience 30-36 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, although one property on Wynfield Avenue has a reading of 36-40 µg/m<sup>3</sup>,

- the properties surveyed on Styal Road and Tedder Drive experienced readings of 20-30  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  and 30-36  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ .

The assessment also revealed that the same properties experienced  $\text{PM}_{10}$  levels on average less than 20  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ .

An assessment was then made of the likely  $\text{NO}_2$  levels once the road scheme was in operation, those readings reveal the following:

- the levels of  $\text{NO}_2$  experienced by the residents of Ringway Road would drop to 30-36  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  or 36-40  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ,
- the dwellings on Croyde Close and Wynfield Avenue would still experience levels of 30-36  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ , although one property on Wynfield Avenue would see a reduction to 30-36  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ,
- the properties on Tedder Drive would experience an increase from 20-30  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  to 30-36  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ .

A similar assessment was then made of the likely  $\text{PM}_{10}$  levels once the road scheme was in operation and that revealed the residents of Ringway Road, Croyde Close and Wynfield Avenue would experience decreases in  $\text{PM}_{10}$  of between 0.1 and 4  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  or higher. The properties on Tedder Drive and Styal Road would experience slight increases in  $\text{PM}_{10}$  levels of between 0.1 to 2  $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ .

The above findings highlight that once traffic is diverted away from Ringway Road to the A6MARR, the majority of Manchester residents who live closest to the scheme will see a reduction in the levels of mono-nitrogen oxides ( $\text{NO}$  and  $\text{NO}_2$ ) and particulate matter ( $\text{PM}_{10}$ ). A small number of residents will experience increases in average concentrations of these compounds but as these increases are imperceptible it is not considered that vehicle emissions associated with the A6MARR are high enough to cause a significant adverse effect on local residents.

During construction the number of vehicles visiting the site could produce up to 100 vehicle movements per day. A preliminary review of potential numbers of construction related HGV's using any of the seven principle access routes along the whole of the site has indicated that increases will not exceed the recognised thresholds (200 vehicle movements) signalling a need for local air quality assessment. No further assessment has therefore been undertaken and no significant impact is considered likely. In light of this, it is not considered that vehicle emissions associated with the construction process are high enough to cause a significant adverse effect on local residents.

The assessments have demonstrated that the scale and nature of the proposed works pose a risk of dust-related nuisance for properties within the 350m study area considered. They have demonstrated the most susceptible will be those within 50m of the working areas and to the north/north-west, which will be down wind of the works. Only two properties on Ringway Road (Newlyn and Oakfield) are within 50 metres of the site boundary. In light of the potential nuisance, appropriate mitigation measures have accordingly been identified which will be implemented to control and mitigate potential dust deposition. Taking into account the measures proposed, it has

been concluded dust deposition associated with the works will not constitute a significant effect. It is not anticipated that any dust would be generated through the day to day operation of the A6MARR.

Noise and Vibration - The assessments of noise and vibration have been focused on:

- assessment of potential noise impacts in relation to sensitive receptors during construction of the proposed scheme;
- assessment of potential traffic-related noise impacts and nuisance relative to sensitive receptors following the opening of the proposed scheme during daytime and night time;
- assessment of potential impacts on sensitive receptors as a result of vibration associated with the construction of the proposed scheme; and
- assessment of potential impacts on sensitive receptors as a result of vibration associated with the future use of the proposed scheme.

Assessments of the predicted noise and vibration levels indicate that there will be a negligible impact during construction from both plant and construction vehicles. Notwithstanding these predictions, a suitably worded planning condition will ensure that all external plant and machinery is acoustically insulated in order to protect the amenity of local residents.

As with air quality, assessments have been made of the likely impact of the A6MARR, in terms of noise, upon the residents of Ringway Road, Croyde Close, Wynfield Avenue, Styal Road and Tedder Drive. These assessments have revealed that the residents of Ringway Road, Croyde Close and Wynfield Avenue will see a decrease in noise levels of between -1 to -5 dB or greater, while the properties on Tedder Drive and Styal Road would see an increase of between 1 to 5 dB. The reduction in noise levels to be experienced by the residents of Ringway Road, Croyde Close and Wynfield Avenue is again due to the diversion of traffic away from Ringway Road to the A6MARR. A small number of residents on Tedder Drive and Styal Road will experience increases in noise levels but it is recognised that the proposed mitigation measures, i.e. landscaping and fencing, will ensure that any impact is limited.

In light of the above, it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon existing levels of residential amenity.

**Impact upon the Highway Network** – The LHA supports the principal of the A6 MARR link given the benefits it will bring to the wider area. The scheme will increase access to Manchester Airport and improve connectivity across South Manchester.

However, a condition should be applied that requires mitigation to be put in place on the local roads in Wythenshawe to the south of Ringway Road, prior to the construction of the Relief Road. This is to ensure that strategic traffic does not route through this area. It is noted that the Transport Assessment proposes such mitigation in the form of traffic management measures, to be agreed with Manchester City Council.

There are a number of points within the submission that require clarification and also a number of details that require amending. The LHA is working with the applicant to address the points of detail and to obtain clarification where this is required. However, they have recommended that a condition that requiring the applicant to submit detailed proposals for approval by the City Council prior to construction commencing.

Subject to the inclusion of appropriately worded planning conditions to address the points raised, the LHA have no objections to the proposal.

**Built Heritage** – Within Manchester there are no listed buildings or scheduled ancient monuments in the curtilage of the site or adjacent to the route of the A6MARR.

**Archaeology** – The applicants' assessment has revealed three potential sites along the route of the A6MARR within Manchester. All have low heritage ratings and it is acknowledged that one has already been destroyed by Ringway Road. As these potential sites are of only local or regional potential significance, GMAAS have confirmed that it is acceptable that they can be disturbed by development ground works as long as a record is made through an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which is subject to a planning condition. Accordingly a condition will be attached to any approval granted requiring the submission of a WSI.

**Ecology and Nature Conservation** – A number of surveys have been undertaken by the applicant in respect of the route of the A6MARR and the wider area in order to assess the impact upon flora and fauna. Those studies and the year they were undertaken are as follows:

Protected Species:

- Bat activity – May and June 2011, March and October 2013
- Badger – March 2013
- Great Crested Newts – March – June 2013 (supported by previous work undertaken during February – June 2010)
- Otter – March to May 2011, March to June 2012

A Phase 1 habitat survey was also undertaken in March 2011.

The findings of these reports are outlined below:

**Bats** – An ecological desk study was undertaken to identify any historical records and statutory or non-statutory designated sites relevant to bats within the study area, i.e. land within the scheme and the wider area within a 2km buffer.

In addition, a site walkover survey extending to 50 metres either side of the full extent of the scheme was completed in March 2013 in order to identify trees which could support bat roosts. Sixty-one trees along or in the vicinity of the A6MARR were identified as having features suitable to support bats, either as a roost or individually. Only one of these trees is situated within the Manchester element of the proposal

and it is located adjacent to the proposed balancing pond off Styal Road. Following their identification, emergence/return surveys were undertaken during September and October 2013 to determine whether trees were used by roosting bats. Each tree was surveyed twice; once at dusk and once at dawn, to look for bats emerging from or returning to roosts in the trees. No bats were seen entering roost sites within the trees during return surveys or exiting trees during emergence surveys.

**Badgers** – No evidence of badger habitation has been found along or aside the route of the A6MARR within Manchester.

**Great Crested Newts** – There is one pond along the proposed alignment of the A6MARR and it is located approximately 200 metres to the west of Styal Road. Surveys of this pond have revealed Great Crested Newts to be absent.

**Breeding Birds** – Removal of scrub, hedges and other habitat will risk killing breeding birds or damaging their nests. Removal also represents an overall permanent loss of breeding bird habitat throughout all the proposed scheme. To mitigate against any impact trees, scrub, hedgerows and other nesting bird habitat will be cleared outside of the bird breeding season (March-July) to avoid killing or injuring breeding birds or their dependant young. This will be enforced through the use of a planning condition .

It should be noted that while alternative habitats will be created along the route of the A6MARR, any close to Manchester Airport will be designed so as to discourage large flock forming species of birds so as not to compromise aerodrome safeguarding.

**Otters/Water Vole** – The lack of a water course within the Manchester element of the proposal means that there is no evidence of otter or water vole presence.

**Hedgerows** – There are a number of hedges to be lost, primarily those that form rear or side garden boundaries for those properties on Ringway Road or Tedder Drive. These hedges have been found to be species poor and their loss is not significant. As noted above their removal will be carefully undertaken to ensure to killing or injuring breeding birds or their dependant young during the bird breeding season.

While the submitted ecological surveys reveal there to be no protected species within or adjacent to the Manchester element of the A6MARR the issues raised by GMEU are acknowledged and as a result a number of conditions requiring further survey work to be undertaken are suggested in this instance. As has been recorded above, it is not anticipated that these further surveys will reveal the presence of any further protected species, particular within Manchester, but rather will inform what mitigation measures will be most appropriate in this instance.

**Trees** – There is very little tree coverage along this element of the route, primarily due to the fact that the site of the A6MARR runs alongside the existing Airport rail spur and the site is close to Manchester Airport and tree planting is discouraged in order to prevent large scale bird habitation and the potential resultant bird-strike. The tree identified in the bat survey is proposed to be felled to facilitate the provision of the balancing pond and given the lack of bat presence there is no objection to this.

While replacement tree planting will not be possible in this location, for the reasons referred to above, it is proposed to plant replacement hedging along the route of the A6MARR in order to provide both screening and replacement habitat.

**Water quality and Drainage** – The nearest water courses to the site are Baguley Brook and Gatley Brook and it is into these that water is proposed to be drained from the A6MARR. To supplement this, the applicants intend to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) into the scheme to ensure that the changes of flow, water quality or drainage into these water courses are not unduly impacted upon. The Environment Agency have assessed the proposal and have raised no objections to it, subject to the recommendations of the submitted flood risk assessment being conditioned. In light of this and the fact that an appropriately worded condition will be attached to any consent granted, it is considered that the impact upon water quality and drainage will be minimal.

**Public Rights of Way (PRoW)** – One field footpath (FP253) passes through the application site, though it is not within the area reserved for the construction of the A6MARR itself. It is proposed to stop up this PRoW and divert it over a distance of 137 metres. The footpaths on Styal Road, along with Regional Cycle Route 85 that runs along the western edge of Styal Road, will remain in-situ and will only be interrupted by the provision of entry and egress points to the A6MARR. Overall the impact of the proposal upon PRoW in Manchester is negligible.

**Cycle Ways** – The provision of a cycleway along the A6MARR, which ties into Regional Cycle Route 85, is welcomed.

**Contaminated Land** – All contaminated land effects associated with the site have been investigated and have been assessed as not significant. Notwithstanding this, it is felt prudent to attach a planning condition requiring the provision of final verification reports to ensure that any risk from land contaminants is minimised.

**Human Rights Act 1998 considerations** – This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end the Committee must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, the Head of Planning, Building Control & Licensing has concluded that some rights conferred by these articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the approval of the application is proportionate to the wider benefits of approval and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

**Wythenshawe Area Committee** have recommended that the application be **APPROVED** by the Planning and Highways Committee.

**Head of Planning** recommends that the Planning and Highways Committee are **MINDED TO APPROVE** planning application 104094/FO/2013/S2, subject to referral to the Secretary of State under The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009 as a 'Departure' due to development within the Green Belt, on the basis that the Council has taken the environmental information in the Environmental Statement (as defined in the EIA regulations) into consideration and the proposal is considered to accord with the following policies which are summarised in the body of the report: SP1, DM1, DM 2, EN1, EN9, EN13, EN14, EN15, EN16, EN17, T 1, T 2, UDP policy DC22.1, and UDP policy DC26.1 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document;

1. Policy SP1, as development will maximise the potential of the City's transport infrastructure and is a vital component in the growth of Manchester Airport, which is recognised as a catalyst for the regional economy,
2. Policy DM1, as the proposal will not have a detrimental impact upon residential amenity or highway safety.
3. Policy DM 2, as the proposal will not affect the operational integrity or safety of Manchester Airport or Manchester Radar.
4. Policy EN1, as the proposal will retain the areas open character as far as is possible.
5. Policy EN9, as the proposal will introduce replacement green infrastructure along its length and providing linkages to and between existing green infrastructure.
6. Policy EN13, as the policy will not have a detrimental impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.
7. Policy EN14, as the proposal will be designed to minimise water run-off and associated flood risk.
8. Policy EN15, as the proposal will not have a detrimental impact existing ecology.
9. Policy EN16, as the proposal will not have a detrimental impact upon air quality within the vicinity of the site.
10. Policy EN17, as the proposal will not have a detrimental impact upon water quality, either through construction or when in operation.
11. Policy T 1, as the proposal will improve and develop appropriate road transport routes and will develop further cycle networks.
12. Policy T 2, as the proposal will provide strong links between residential areas in the South and the Regional Centre and improving connectivity with the Airport.
13. UDP policy DC22.1, as the existing footpath will not be closed but diverted.
14. UDP policy DC26.1, as the proposal will result in a reduction in noise levels experienced by the majority of residents living adjacent to this element of the A6MARR.

### **Conditions and/or Reasons**

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

3. No development that is hereby approved shall commence unless and until samples and specifications of all materials to be used on the development, including retaining walls, lighting columns and fencing, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable to the City Council as local planning authority in the interests of the visual amenity of the area within which the site is located, as specified in policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

4. Prior to the development hereby approved commencing, the full technical details of the highway mitigation measures as set out within the SEMMMS A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Major Scheme Business Case date stamped as received by the City Council on the XXXXXX shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In the interests of pedestrian and highway safety, pursuant to Policy DM1 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

5. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Stage 2 Road Safety Audit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - In the interests of pedestrian and highway safety, pursuant to Policy DM1 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

6. No installation of lighting (permanent or temporary) shall commence until full details of the proposed lighting scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The development shall be subsequently carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - To avoid endangering the safe operation of aircraft, pursuant to Circular 1/2003 Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas: the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites

and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002 and Policy DM2 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

7. The installation of any signage shall not commence until full details of the signage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The development shall be subsequently carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - To avoid endangering the safe operation of aircraft, pursuant to Circular 1/2003 Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas: the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002 and Policy DM2 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

8. The installation of the "Styal Attenuation Pond" as identified on drawing reference XXXX shall not commence until full details of the bird control measures that are to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The development shall be subsequently carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - To avoid endangering the safe operation of aircraft through the attraction of birds, pursuant to Circular 1/2003 Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas: the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002 and Policy DM2 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

9. No development shall commence until a the fully technical detailed design of the approved development as identified on drawing reference XXXX has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The development shall be subsequently carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - To ensure the proposals satisfactorily address the approach lighting associated with the operation of Manchester Airport and avoid endangering the safe operation of aircraft, pursuant to Circular 1/2003 Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas: the Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002 and Policy DM2 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

10. The development hereby approved shall have foul and surface water drained in accordance with the principles outlined in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment which was prepared by AECOM Ltd Ref: 1007/6.7/061 rev 5, dated 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2013 and the submitted Drainage Strategy Report and associated plans (prepared by AECOM Ltd ref: 60212470/HIG/001, dated August 2011). For the avoidance of doubt, any foul water must drain separately to surface water and no surface water will be permitted to discharge directly or indirectly into the public foul or combined sewer. Any surface water draining from the site must be restricted to the agreed rates as set out within the submitted Drainage Strategy.

Reason - To prevent the increased risk of flooding, pursuant to Policy DM1 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

11. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a noise impact assessment, including any necessary mitigation measures and their associated effectiveness/noise reduction shall be submitted to and approved by the City Council. The development shall be subsequently carried out in accordance with the approved mitigation measures which shall be in-situ before the development is operational.

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby noise sensitive properties, pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

12. No demolition or development ground works shall take place until the applicant or their agents or their successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological works in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The WSI shall cover the following:

1. A phased programme and methodology to include:
  - an agreed scope of mitigation for each historic building and archaeological site affected by the scheme, including as appropriate the following elements
  - archaeological evaluation
  - where the above identifies significant remains, targeted archaeological excavation
  - watching brief
  - palaeo-environmental sampling and analysis
  - historic building survey
2. A programme for post investigation assessment to include:
  - analysis of the site investigation records and finds
  - production of a final report on the significance of the heritage interest represented.
3. Provision for archive deposition of the report, finds and records of the site investigation.
4. Dissemination of the results through publication and other media.
5. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the approved WSI.

Reason - In accordance with NPPF policy 12, paragraph 141, "to record and advance the understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) and "to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible".

13. No development shall take place until a schedule for the undertaking of a pre-commencement survey of bat roost activity has been submitted to and approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The bat roost activity survey shall be subsequently undertaken in accordance with the approved schedule.

Reason - To ensure the protection of habitat of species that are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or as subsequently amended in order to comply with policy EN15 of the Core Strategy.

14. No development shall take place until detailed mitigation/compensation strategies for the following species have been submitted to and approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority:

Great crested newts (each meta-population)  
Bats  
Breeding birds

The strategies shall be based on up-to date survey data and where appropriate the strategies shall include details such as: measures to avoid direct impact on individual species; timings of works; location and design of compensatory habitats; measures to avoid/reduce disturbance of individual species or destruction of terrestrial habitat, measures to reduce road mortality, and a monitoring program to assess the outcomes of these strategies. The approved strategies shall be subsequently implemented in full within a timescale previously approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure the protection of habitat of species that are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or as subsequently amended in order to comply with policy EN15 of the Core Strategy.

15. No development shall take place until detailed landscape/ecological mitigation plans, including replacement trees and woodland, hedgerows, grassland and ponds utilising locally native species has been submitted to and approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be subsequently implemented in full within a timescale previously approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Reason - To ensure the protection of habitat of species that are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or as subsequently amended in order to comply with policy EN15 of the Core Strategy.

16. No site clearance or vegetation clearance work should be undertaken in the bird nesting season (March – August inclusive) unless it can be otherwise demonstrated that no birds are breeding on the site.

Reason - To ensure the protection of habitat of species that are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or as subsequently amended in order to comply with policy EN15 of the Core Strategy.

17. No development shall take place until a method statement for the control and eradication of invasive species such as Japanese knotweed and Himalayan balsam has been submitted to and approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The submitted method statement shall include location maps for all stands and method of control, including timings of the work and disposal of any contaminated

material. The development shall be subsequently carried out in accordance with the approved details.

18. Any buildings, other built structures or trees, assessed as being more than low risk for bat habitation, which are not removed prior to March 2016 shall be re-assessed for bat habitation and the information and any mitigation required shall be submitted to and be approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure the protection of habitat of species that are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or as subsequently amended in order to comply with policy EN15 of the Core Strategy.

19. Any ponds within the footprint of the development or that fall inside the exclusion fencing that have not been removed by March 2016 shall be reassessed and/or surveyed for great crested newts habitation and the information and any mitigation required shall be submitted to and be approved by the City Council as Local Planning Authority

Reason - To ensure the protection of habitat of species that are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or as subsequently amended in order to comply with policy EN15 of the Core Strategy.

20. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a scheme that includes the following components to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the City Council as local planning authority:

- a) A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
  - all previous uses potential contaminants associated with those uses
  - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
  - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.
- b) A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.
- c) The results of the site investigation and detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
- d) A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the express written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason – To ensure a safe form of development which poses no unacceptable risk of pollution, pursuant to Policy DM1 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

21. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development shall be carried out until the developer has submitted and received approval for a remediation strategy to the City Council as local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reason - To ensure a safe form of development which poses no unacceptable risk of pollution, pursuant to Policy DM1 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

22. CEMP Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) must be submitted to and be approved by the City Council as local planning authority. The CEMP must include: a detailed assessment in accordance with British Standard 5228 as part of the finalisation of working methods and informed by the specific plant and machinery which will be used to show how the main construction effects of the development are to be minimised; Noise mitigation, that will include, as a minimum, all the points stated in Section 13.5.29 of the Environmental Statement dated stamped as received by the local planning authority on the XXXXXX. The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with approved details.

Reason – To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation, pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

23. Construction Management Plan No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) with detailed method statements of construction, including details of and position of any proposed cranes to be used on the site, a detailed programme of the works and risk assessments, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved CMP shall include agreed safe methods of working adjacent to the Metrolink Hazard Zone and shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The CMP shall provide for: -

1. the designated route for construction and delivery vehicles
2. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
3. loading and unloading of plant and materials;
4. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
5. construction and demolition methods to be used; including the use of cranes
6. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding;
7. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction and;
8. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
9. a bird hazard management.

Reason - In the interests of highway safety, to safeguard the amenities of the locality and to ensure that the developer complies with all the necessary system clearances and agrees safe methods of working to meet the safety requirements of working above and adjacent to the Metrolink system, pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document.

#### **Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

The documents referred to in the course of this report are either contained in the file(s) relating to application ref: 104094/FO/2013/S2 held by planning or are City Council planning policies, the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester, national planning guidance documents, or relevant decisions on other applications or appeals, copies of which are held by the Planning Division.

#### **The following residents, businesses and other third parties in the area were consulted/notified on the application:**

Greater Manchester Police  
GMC Fire Service  
English Heritage (NW Region)  
United Utilities Water PLC  
Transport For Greater Manchester  
Environment Agency  
Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service  
Natural England  
Manchester Airport Development Company  
Manchester Airport Safeguarding Officer  
The Highways Agency  
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit  
Wildlife Trust  
TREMAR Residents Association  
Network Rail  
National Planning Casework Unit  
Department For Transport  
National Grid  
Health & Safety Executive  
Cheshire East  
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council  
Ringway Parish Council  
16 Ringway Road, Moss Nook, Manchester, M22 5ND  
100 Thornsgreen Road, Manchester, M22 1GD  
Servicetek Ltd, Shadow Moss Road, Manchester, M22 6JT  
1000, 1500, 3000, 3500 Aviator Way, Manchester, M22 5TG  
78-88 Ravenscar Crescent, Manchester, M22 0JA  
24 Lambourne Close, Manchester, M22 1HS  
1-31, 2-56 Beaford Road, Manchester, M22 0AG  
27, 22-26 Lambourne Close, Manchester, M22 1HS  
2-30 Hazelwood Road, Manchester, M22 0AD  
25-27, 2-30, 42-44 Trenchard Drive, Manchester, M22 5LZ  
1-9 Maroon Road, Manchester, M22 5NB  
2-108 Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5ND  
1-8 Wynfield Avenue, Manchester, M22 5NE  
1-7 Emerald Road, Manchester, M22 5WA

Sylverne, Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5WD  
Newlyn, Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5WF  
Oakfield, Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5WF  
Cherry Tree Cottage, Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5WF  
Rose Cottage, Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5WF  
Shadow Moss Farm, Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5WD  
1-8 Croyde Close, Manchester, M22 5NT  
17 Tedder Drive, Manchester, M22 5UB  
Smithy Farm, Tedder Drive, Manchester, M22 5UB  
Moss Nook House, Trenchard Drive, Manchester, M22 5NA  
Tatton Arms, Trenchard Drive, Manchester, M22 5LZ  
Stables Cottage, Trenchard Drive, Manchester, M22 5LZ  
Yew Tree Cottage, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5TJ  
Yew Tree House, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5TJ  
Gateway House, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5WY  
Manchester International Office Centre, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5WB  
Styal Road Service Station, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5WB  
Prestbury Court, Greencourts, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5LW  
Capital House, 333 Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5LW  
Hale Court, Greencourts, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5LW  
Adlington Court, 333 Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5LW  
Cognos Greencourts, 333 Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5LW  
Primrose Cottage Nurseries, Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5WF  
Trident 1-3, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5WN  
Adlington Court, 333 Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5LW  
Greencourts, 333 Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5LW  
Renold House, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5WZ  
Redcliffe, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5YA  
Holme Lea, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5YA  
Store, Redcliffe, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5WB  
MS And J Motors, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5WB  
Rear Cottage Redcliffe, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5YA  
Airport Hotel, Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5WH  
Airport Hotel, Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5WH  
64-90, 130-166 Ravenscar Crescent, Manchester, M22 0JA  
80-86 Thornsgreen Road, Manchester, M22 1GD  
2-20 Lambourne Close, Manchester, M22 1HS  
1-12 Lynside Walk, Manchester, M22 0HG  
1-47 Carsdale Road, Manchester, M22 0HQ  
1-5 Copgrove Walk, Manchester, M22 0LG  
15-57 Shadow Moss Road, Manchester, M22 0LH  
2-8 Lismore Walk, Manchester, M22 0LJ  
1-8 Foley Walk, Manchester, M22 0LL  
1-8 Brading Walk, Manchester, M22 0LN  
1-30 Swithin Road, Manchester, M22 0LR  
1-10 Belleville Avenue, Manchester, M22 0HS  
1-6 Beagle Walk, Manchester, M22 0LP  
1-38 Robinsbay Road, Manchester, M22 0LT  
2-29 Crispin Road, Manchester, M22 0LU  
1-10 Alric Walk, Manchester, M22 0LW  
88-98 Thornsgreen Road, Manchester, M22 1GD  
1-25 Lambourne Close, Manchester, M22 1HS  
1-27 Hazelwood Road, Manchester, M22 0AD  
1-5 Boundary Terrace, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5UA

Boundary Farm, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5YA  
NEH 36 Ltd, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5YA  
East View, Styal Road, Manchester, SK9 4LE  
126 Hollin Lane, Manchester, SK9 4LD  
Park View, Styal Road, Manchester, Sk9 4LD  
Rear Cottage, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5YA  
11 Moss Lane, Manchester, Sk9 4LF  
Ellwood, Styal Road, Manchester, Sk9 4LE  
Parkfield House, Styal Road, Manchester, MSK9 4LE  
Flight Shuttle Services, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5YA  
Bloors, Styal Road, Manchester, M22 5YA  
127 Hollin Lane, Manchester, Sk9 4LD  
122 Hollin Lane, Manchester, SK9 4LD  
Daytona, Styal Road, Manchester, SK9 4LE  
9 Moss Lane, Manchester, SK9 4LF  
Holmfield, Styal Road, Manchester, Sk9 4LE

**Representations were received from the following third parties:**

English Heritage (NW Region)  
United Utilities Water PLC  
Transport For Greater Manchester  
Environment Agency  
Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service  
Natural England  
The Highways Agency  
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit  
Network Rail  
National Grid  
Friends of the Earth  
Stockport Friends of the Earth,  
Manchester Friends of the Earth,  
Prestbury Parish Council,  
Manchester Green Party,  
Campaign for Better Transport/ North West Transport Roundtable,  
Cheshire Wildlife Trust,  
Campaign to Protect Rural England  
16a Carsdale Road, Manchester, M22 0HQ  
16 Ringway Road, Moss Nook, Manchester, M22 5ND  
104 Acre Lane, Cheadle Hulme, SK8 7PD  
14 Parklands Drive, Weston, Crewe, CW2 5FH  
8 Old Hall Cres, Handforth, Wilmslow, SK9 3AX  
Conray, Woodford Road, Poynton, SK12 1EG  
298 Mauldeth Road West, Manchester, M21 7RF  
Barr Green Cottage, Blossoms Lane, Woodford, SK7 1RG  
27 Powicke Drive, Romiley, Stockport, SK6 3EG  
218 Chester Road, Poynton, SK12 1HP  
Drumlins, 57 Chelford Road, Prestbury, SK10 4PT  
3 Beech Court, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 2AW  
Robinson's Nurseries Ltd, Yew Tree Farm, Bolshaw Road, Heald Green, Cheadle, SK8 3PS  
12 Coppice Avenue, Disley, Stockport, Sk12 2LS  
28 Woodlands Road, Handforth, SK9 3AU  
3 x No Address Supplied

**Relevant Contact Officer** : David Lawless  
**Telephone number** : 0161 234 4543  
**Email** : d.lawless@manchester.gov.uk





